

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are pending. No claims have been amended, canceled or added.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26

On page 2 of the non-Final Office Action of March 28, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,681,108 to Terry et al. (“Terry”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,293,644 to Barry et al. (“Barry”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to, in an initiator device having a wireless transceiver, a method for discovering a name of a responding device. The method includes, among other things, broadcasting a first wireless signal to be received by the responding device, receiving a second wireless signal from the responding device, wherein the second wireless signal is sent in response to a first wireless signal and includes an address for the responding device, transmitting a wireless request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from a memory cache, and receiving a name for the responding device in response to the wireless request.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Terry, at col. 6, lines 53-66, discloses a second wireless signal sent in response to a first wireless signal and including an address for the responding device. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Terry, at col. 6, lines 53-66 discloses:

Each device also broadcasts its unique ID 101 using a short range radio frequency (RF) signal 109. Thus, the "location" extends over the range a distance that the transmitted signal can be received, and no farther. When a device receives an unknown unique ID over the broadcast channel 109, that is a unique ID that is not stored in its known list 10; the unknown ID is recorded on the location list 20. The date, time, and duration of the encounter with the stranger are also stored in the memory and comprise an encounter record 21 in

the location list. The process of broadcasting and receiving IDs and recording the IDs occurs automatically in the background; the users of the devices, both the broadcasters and the receivers, are unaware of this activity when it occurs.

Thus, Terry discloses that each device broadcasts a unique ID via a short range RF signal.

Upon receiving an unknown unique ID, information pertaining to an encounter is stored. The

Examiner appears to be interpreting the broadcast unique ID as the second wireless signal.

However, the broadcast unique ID is not received in response to another signal. Instead,

Terry discloses that a device broadcasts its unique ID and listens for other devices

broadcasting their unique IDs (see Terry, at col. 7, lines 38-40). Barry also fails to disclose

or suggest this feature. Consequently, neither Terry nor Barry, either separately or in

combination, disclose or suggest receiving a second wireless signal from the responding

device, wherein the second wireless signal is sent in response to a first wireless signal, as

required by claim 1.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Terry, at col. 6, lines 53-66, discloses transmitting a wireless request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from a memory cache. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As mentioned above, Terry discloses that a device broadcasts its unique ID and listens for other devices broadcasting their unique IDs (see Terry, at col. 7, lines 38-40). No request is transmitted for a name of a responding device. Barry also fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Consequently, neither Terry nor Barry, either separately or in combination, disclose or suggest transmitting a wireless request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from a memory cache, as required by claim 1.

Independent claims 9 and 18 recite similar features and are patentable over Terry in view of Barry for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 18 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-8, 11-17 and 19-26 depend from one of claims 1, 9 and 18, either directly or as a base claim and are patentable over Terry in view of Barry for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 9 and 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-8, 11-17 and 19-26 be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are patentable for reasons of their own. For example, claims 3, 14 and 23 further recite removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit, wherein the entry comprises a name and an address. On pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Terry, at col. 8, lines 24-29, discloses this feature. Applicants disagree.

Terry, at col. 8, lines 24-29, discloses:

List friends 640 allows the user to edit the known list 10, e.g., remove IDs and names of individuals no longer considered "friends." Delete all messages 650 removes any pending messages stored in the device, and show messages 660 displays pending messages.

Thus, Terry discloses that a user may edit a known list of friends and may remove names of individuals on the list. However, editing or removing IDs and names of individuals is not equivalent to removing from a memory cache an entry for one of the devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit, as required by claims 3, 14 and 23. Barry also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Terry.

Claim 24 further recites that an entry is removed from the memory cache according to an aging scheme, wherein the aging scheme ranks entries according to frequency of use. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Terry, at col. 8, lines 24-29, discloses this feature. Applicants disagree.

As can be seen above, Terry, at col. 8, lines 24-29, discloses that a user may edit a known list of friends and may remove names of individuals on the list. However, a user editing a known list of friends or removing names of individuals on the list is very different from removing an entry from a memory cache according to an aging scheme, as required by claim 24. Barry also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Terry.

Further, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Terry with Barry. Terry discloses users being equipped with portable devices that continually broadcast unique IDs (Terry, at col. 5, lines 28-29). Other users devices in close proximity may receive and record the broadcasted IDs, which marks an instance when at least two devices (and users) share the same location (Terry, at col. 5, lines 32-35). Using the pairs of unique IDs and shared locations, along with a list of known users from each user, a determination can be made as to whether two or more users, who are strangers to one another, shared a location and whether these two or more users share a common friend (Terry, col. 5, lines 42-48).

Barry discloses a method and apparatus for providing efficient support subfleet calls in an RF communication system (Barry, at col. 2, lines 25-28). When a message having a secondary identification is transmitted to a communication unit having a stored secondary identification that sufficiently matches the secondary identification in the message, the communication unit responds to the transmitted message (Barry, Abstract, lines 4-11).

Terry is concerned with collecting information with respect to devices broadcasting unique IDs while in close proximity with one another. Barry is concerned with an efficient means of communicating in a subfleet in which a select group of communication units are addressed without disturbing other communication units (see Barry, at col. 1, lines 61-65, and col. 2, lines 29-35). Applicants submit that one would not be motivated to combine the device disclosed by Terry, which collects information pertaining to other devices that come into close proximity, with that of Barry, which discloses an efficient method of addressing a

group of communication units. Applicants submit that altering the device of Terry such that communications between devices efficiently address a group of devices would overcome the purpose of gathering information only on those devices which come into close proximity with one another. Further, Barry is not concerned with communications of devices that only come into close proximity with one another.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submit that the claims are patentable over Terry in view of Barry and respectfully request that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 28, 2006

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 49637

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433